

## REMARKS

Claims 1-17 are now pending in the application. Claims 1, 4, 7, 13 and 14 are now amended. Claim 17 is now added. The new claim and claim amendments are fully supported by the application as filed and do not present new subject matter. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

### REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103 AND NEW CLAIM 17

Claims 1-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsushita et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,885,418). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Amended independent Claim 1 recites, in part, forming a colored layer that is overlapping a reflective layer in a pixel using a mask, wherein the mask has a pattern having a two-dimensional shape with no corner.

Amended Claim 4 recites, in part, forming a colored layer that is overlapping a reflective layer in a pixel using a mask, wherein the mask has a pattern with a polygonal two-dimensional shape and has all interior angles larger than 90°.

Amended Claim 7 recites, in part, forming a colored layer that is overlapping a reflective layer in a pixel using a mask, wherein the mask has a pattern in which points of intersection of respective normals to two arbitrary tangents on an outer periphery of an opening are dispersed. This feature is illustrated in, for example, Figure 20 at mask pattern P7 and in the specification as filed in paragraph [0119]. As illustrated in Figure 20 at P7 and as claimed in Claim 7, the mask pattern P7 has no corners.

Amended Claim 13 recites, in part, a colored layer overlapping a reflective layer in a pixel, the colored layer is exposed using a mask. The mask has a pattern having a two-dimensional shape with no corner.

Amended Claim 14 recites, in part, forming a colored layer by exposing the colored layer using a mask. The mask has a pattern having a two-dimensional shape with no corner and the pattern has an asymmetrical two-dimensional shape.

The Matsushita et al. reference appears to disclose forming a color filter 10 using an electrodeposition method for producing a color filter. Col. 8, Lines 64-65. The color filter 10 can also be formed using a pigment dispersion method, a printing method, or a dying method. Col. 9, Lines 20-25. The Matsushita et al. reference fails to disclose or suggest forming a color filter using a mask.

The Matsushita et al. reference fails to disclose or suggest: forming a colored layer using a mask having a pattern with a two-dimensional shape with no corner, as set forth in amended Claim 1; forming a colored layer using a mask that has a pattern with a polygonal two-dimensional shape and all interior angles larger than 90°, as set forth in amended Claim 4; forming a colored layer using a mask that has a pattern in which points of intersection of respective normals to two arbitrary tangents on an outer periphery of the opening are dispersed, as set forth in amended Claim 7; forming a colored layer using a mask that has a pattern having a 2-dimensional shape with no corner, as set forth in amended Claim 13; or forming a colored layer using a mask having a 2-dimensional shape with no corner and the pattern has an asymmetrical 2-dimensional shape, as set forth in Claim 14. Therefore, the Matsushita et al. reference

fails to disclose or suggest amended Claims 1, 4, 7, 13, and 14 and those claims dependent therefrom.

The Matsushita et al. reference appears to further disclose, with reference to Figure 13, colored filters 10 having openings 20. The openings 20 are square. The Matsushita et al. reference fails to disclose or suggest that the openings 20 can be any shape other than square.

As identified by Applicants in paragraph [0013] of the application as filed, such square openings are undesirable when the openings are formed using photolithography because the corners of the openings are often deformed and reproducibility of the opening shape is low. Applicants have determined that, when using photolithography to form openings in the colored layer, elimination of corners from the openings decreases deformities and increases reproducibility of the openings. Such unexpected results are not disclosed or suggested by the Matsushita et al. reference.

The Matsushita et al. reference fails to disclose or suggest the following: a colored layer having an incision section, as set forth in Claim 6 and as illustrated in, for example, Figure 15a at reference numeral 815g; an area that the colored layer is not formed is provided in a pixel, the area is superimposed on at least a part of a reflecting section and wherein the area has a two-dimensional shape crossing the pixel, as set forth in Claim 8 and illustrated in, for example, Figure 4 at 214ra; a colored layer having an incision section, wherein the incision section provided in one pixel is disposed with respect to an incision section provided in another pixel adjacent thereto so that the one and the other pixels do not adjoin each other with a boundary region between the one of the pixels and the another of the pixels, as set forth in Claim 11 and illustrated in, for

example, Figure 11; a colored layer corresponding to a reflection section having an opening having a circular two-dimensional shape in at least one pixel and the colored layer corresponding to the reflection section has an opening having an oblong two-dimensional shape in at least another one of the pixels, as set forth in Claim 15; a colored layer having an opening with an oblong circular two-dimensional shape in at least one pixel, and in at least another pixel an area that the colored layer is not formed is provided, the area is superimposed on at least a part of the reflecting section, the area has a two-dimensional shape crossing the pixel, as set forth in Claim 16; or a first incision section 1015g provided in a colored layer of a first pixel 1010P adjoins a second incision section 1015g provided in a colored layer of a second pixel 1010P that is adjacent the first pixel, as set forth in new Claim 17 and illustrated in, for example, Figure 17.

Therefore, the Matsushita et al. reference fails to disclose or suggest Claims 6, 8, 11, 15, 16 and 17, and those claims dependent therefrom.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the Section 103 rejection.

#### CONCLUSION


It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt

and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: Dec 19, 2005

By:

  
G. Gregory Schivley, Reg. No. 27,382  
~~Bryant E. Wade, Reg. No. 40,844~~

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.  
P.O. Box 828  
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303  
(248) 641-1600

GGS/BGS/les